



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/671,413	09/25/2003	Kamil Mostafa Hajji	02-1006	9388

7590 01/16/2007
Leonard C. Suchyta
c/o Christian Andersen
Verizon Corporate Services Group Inc.
600 Hidden Ridge, HQE03H01
Irving, TX 75038

EXAMINER

DEANE JR, WILLIAM J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2614

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/16/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/671,413	Applicant(s) HAJJI ET AL.	
	Examiner William J. Deane	Art Unit 2614	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 September 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12, 14-27 and 29-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12, 14-27 and 29-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 – 12, 14 – 27 and 29 - 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0114437 (Nabkel et al.) in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0223403 (Higgins) and U.S. Patent No. 6,044,403 (Gerszberg et al.) and further in view of U. S. Patent Application No. 2004/0024754 (Mane et al.).

With respect to claims 1, 11, 14 -19, 25 and 27 – 30, note that Nabkel et al. teach a telephone system which provides an automated voice interface (note announcement device in Fig. 1), permitting the user to verbally specify an object corresponding to predefined objectives (paragraphs 0008 and 0011) including information services (paragraph 0012) and the node acts to implement the object (the above and 0022). Note also paragraphs 0020 and 0032 of Nabkel. As shown above Nabkel et al. teach the claimed limitations except for explicitly reciting that the information services is directory assistance and after receiving the information desired, conducting further action such as connecting a call to a third party (however note, paragraph 0030). However, note that Higgins teaches using directory assistance in a similar manner as claimed by the present application (note Abstract and paragraph

Art Unit: 2614

0038). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have incorporate such an information service as directory assistance as taught by Higgins into the Nabkel et al. device as such would only entail substituting one known service for another. In addition, note that Gerszberg et al. teach an information or directory service that after receiving enough information can present the information, such as a requested phone number and automatically connect the caller to a third party (see Col. 23, lines 4 – 54 of Gerszberg et al.). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have incorporated such a platform as taught by Gerszberg into the Nabkel et al./Higgins device as such would only entail the substitution of one known service platform for another.

With respect to the newly amend portions of the independent claims, please note paragraphs 0002, 0016 and 0026 of Mane et al. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have incorporated such an IVR (ASR) and/or output manager as taught by Mane et al. into the Gerszberg/Nabkel et al./Higgins device as such would only entail the substitution of one suitable input device for another (see also paragraph 0028 of Nabkel et al.).

With respect to claims 2 and 20, note the above and Abstract of Nabkel et al.

With respect to claims 4 – 5, 7 and 22 - 23, note Fig. 4 and paragraphs 0018 and 0030 of Nabkel et al.

With respect to claims 3, 6 and 21, such would be inherent in a wireless system and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to migrate that which is known in wireline to wireless (again, note paragraph 0018).

With respect to claim 8, such a limitation would be inherent in an AIN system.

With respect to claim 9, such verification is inherent unless the service is free which is not the way business is done.

With respect to claims 10 and 24 note paragraph 0030 of Nabkel et al.

With respect to claims 12 and 26, note paragraph 0026 of Nabkel et al.

With respect to claims 31 and 32, if one can be connected to the Internet it would be obvious to be able to retrieve driving instructions. With respect to claim 32, note paragraph 0018 of Mane et al.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 – 12, 14 - 27 and 29 - 32 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2614

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bill Deane whose telephone number is (571) 272-7484. In addition, facsimile transmissions should be directed to Bill Deane at facsimile number (571) 273-8300.

28Nov2006


WILLIAM J. DEANE, JR.
PRIMARY EXAMINER